



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,464	06/01/2001	Yoshiaki Akamatsu	010464	8439

23850 7590 05/14/2003

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP
1725 K STREET, NW
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

RAEVIS, ROBERT R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2856

DATE MAILED: 05/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicant N .

Applicant()

09/870,464

AKAMATSU ET AL.

Examiner

Art Unit

Robert R. Raevis

2856

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5/1, 5/2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 5/3, 4, 5/4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 5/1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Applicant's Statement or ASME (Article AK provided by Applicants).

Applicants describe (page 1, last paragraph) attaching a tool to a spindle, and testing the amount of runout of the tool, relating the runout measurement to runout of the spindle. The ASME article (Figure 2(a)) teaches the same, where the "Perfect workpiece" is a tool.

Neither the Statement nor ASME state that the measurement device/probe is on the base of a machining area, and do not refer to runout diagnosing means.

As to claim 1; it would have been obvious to test the runout within a machining area because like all machines bearings wear necessarily requiring testing after initial use. In addition, it would have been obvious to provide a indicator to indicate when a measurement suggests a defective bearing because indicators allow an operator to react to the indication without any need for mental computations/concerns.

As to claim 5/1; runout testing is carried out at many different speeds.

3. Claims 2 and 5/2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Applicant's Statement or ASME (Article AK provided by Applicants) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of either Iijima et al or Elsing.

As to claims 2 and 5/2; it would have been obvious to employ a noncontact sensor as either Applicants' (of page 1) or ASME's sensor because either Iijima (sensors 42, 43; col. 3, lines 29-32; col. 4, lines 54-64) or Elsing (col. 3, lines 37-45) teach use of a particular noncontacting probes to accurately measure displacement to provide an indication of runout. Applicants' and ASME's generic suggestion of a sensor is suggestive of any particular known sensor.

4. Marron and Toraason et al teach wobble testers.

5. Claims 3, 4, 5/3 and 5/4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert R. Raevs whose telephone number is 703-305-4919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-7722.

Raevs